



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

almost as waste paper. This will assure their ratification and their efficiency. The nations can never again, after the experiences of this Conference, think of each other or stand in the attitude toward each other, except possibly temporarily, that they have stood in the past. The memory of the Conference cannot perish. War cannot reverse the new spirit of fellowship which it has demonstrated. The enlarged consciousness of humanity developed by it will imperiously impose its moral obligations upon all civilized peoples, and out of it will come new coöperation, new conferences, new and still finer conventions.

While the new era of which Mr. de Beaufort speaks as opened by the Conference finds its fundamental significance in this enlarged, clarified spirit of fellowship, we must not forget another phase of it on the practical side. The Conference, when its acts are ratified, will have completed the organization of the peace movement and placed peace at the front in international relations as the supreme guiding idea in the future. The plan adopted for the organization of the international court of arbitration has in it a new feature of immense significance in this regard. The Bureau of the Court is to be under the direction of the foreign ministers accredited to The Hague. Besides the justices, therefore, who are to constitute the membership of the Court, we are to have in these ministers a Permanent Inter-governmental Peace Council, or what may some day amount to a Permanent Peace Congress. Just what this Peace Directorship, which will consist of from thirty to fifty statesmen, will develop into under government direction, it is too early to surmise. But that it will prove a powerful factor in the relations of the nations is perfectly clear. It lifts the ministry to The Hague to the first rank. Henceforth the foremost diplomats will be sent to this capital, "the capital of the world." There, as the guardians and directors of the Bureau of the Court, their relations to one another and to their governments at home will center in the idea of peace. Every government in the world and the whole field of diplomacy will feel the influence.

The organization of peace has passed through three previous stages. The first was that of the peace societies, whose work was to enlighten and develop public sentiment. The second stage was that of the organization of the International Peace Congresses, eventuating in the establishment of the Peace Bureau at Berne. The third was the organization of the Inter-parliamentary Peace Union, a quasi-official body devoting its whole thought to practical peace and arbitration measures. We have now, through the action of the Hague Conference in constituting the court of arbitration and its accessories, entered upon the last, the official inter-governmental stage of the organization of peace.

This fact, connected with that of the enlarged in-

ternational fellowship indicated above, constitutes the real essence of what the Conference has done. Both on the material and the moral side it is difficult to see how it could have been greater or more promising. Time will interpret the great transaction as no one, not even the farthest-sighted of the delegates to the Conference, is capable of interpreting or comprehending it to-day. The impulse, the inspiration of it will be felt in many directions. We may, therefore, well leave to the future, without any attempt at detailed prophecy, the further practical results to which our minds so naturally and anxiously turn. We shall be able to insist upon disarmament and to work for it with all the more earnestness and faith now that the nations have strengthened their desire and proved their ability to coöperate so triumphantly in the constructive ways of peace.

### Andrew D. White's Opinion of the Work of the Hague Conference.

Hon. Andrew D. White, Chairman of the American Commission at the Peace Conference, has given to the press the following statement in regard to the results attained at The Hague. He was in a position to understand thoroughly the spirit which animated the Conference and the difficulties to be overcome, and his conservative judgment may be taken as a fair interpretation of the work done and the good after results practically sure to follow from it. His estimate seems to us below rather than above the real results, for what was done is not to be judged simply in itself, but in its relations to the many causes which led to the holding of the Conference,—causes which will continue to work, and much more powerfully than heretofore:

"In my opinion great good was accomplished, far more, in fact, than any of us dared expect or even hope when we came together.

As to disarmament, everybody really thinking upon the subject must see that a good system of arbitration must come first, and that then, when arbitration has diminished the likelihood of war, the argument for cutting down forces and armaments is greatly strengthened. The logical order then is, first arbitration, and next disarmament.

As to the plan of arbitration, any compulsory system is at present utterly out of the question. There are so many international differences involving questions of race, religion, security, and even national existence, and the difficulty of drawing a line between these and questions which may properly be arbitrated is so insurmountable that there is not a nation on the face of the earth willing to risk an obligatory system. Far better than any compulsory arbitration, which probably, even if it had been adopted by the Conference, not one of the Powers would have finally ratified, is a thoroughly good system of voluntary arbitration, recourse to which public opinion will enforce more and more, and this I earnestly believe the Conference has presented to the world.

Some of the features in the plan adopted were due to the United States, some to Great Britain, some to Russia, some to various other Powers, and, in my judgment, the plan thus adopted is far more valuable than any scheme presented by any one of the Powers at the beginning. The present plan is the result of most careful thought by the foremost international lawyers, statesmen and diplomatists of Europe, to say nothing of other parts of the world; they gave their whole souls to it, their pride was involved in it, and it will, I believe, be found to work satisfactorily.

The great point gained is that, whereas formerly an arbitration court could only be provided after long correspondence between Cabinets, and negotiations between Ministers, and debates in parliamentary bodies, and hunting for proper judges, and discussions as to procedure, and a thousand other delays, just when time was most precious, the Conference has given to the world an arbitration tribunal as an actual and permanent institution, with judges, procedure, officers of the court, place of meeting, and accessories all provided.

It has added, as subsidiary to its main feature, carefully systematized plans of mediation, both general and special, which are likely in many cases to prove exceedingly valuable in preventing nations from drifting into war.

It has also provided a system of commissions of inquiry, by which the real questions and grievances at issue can be ascertained and brought out to be coolly considered, instead of the wild charges, countercharges, calumnies, sensational reports and rumors, which have hitherto done so much to hurry people into war.

We may fairly hope that, as time goes on, a resort to the tribunal now created will become more and more usual and natural, and that the pressure of public opinion in all cases where questions at issue can possibly be settled will be far more effective than any attempt at compulsory resort to a high international court.

This is certainly a great gain, and, as has been very justly observed in a very remarkable and thoughtful recent article in the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, the Conference deserves credit for not attempting to go further. To have done so would have provoked resistance and reaction, which would have left the possibilities of war more serious even than they have been hitherto.

But even without an arbitration plan, the result would have fully justified our two months' work. The extension of the Geneva rules to maritime warfare, and the improvement and establishment of the best system possible at present of the laws and customs of war would of itself be a sufficient result.

With arbitration added to this, I feel that the world will be satisfied in time that we have made a good beginning, valuable indeed at the outset, but likely to grow more and more valuable as time goes on.

As to gradual disarmament, that will come later. Of course the people who insist on having fruit on the day the tree is planted will sneer at our work, but history will, I believe, judge it differently."

Japan has now become a full member of the family of independent nations, the old treaties providing that offending foreigners within her domain should be tried in consular courts having expired. Such trials now take place as in other countries.

## Editorial Notes.

Dr. Paul Carus, in a recent number of *The Open Court*, of which he is the editor, says that "the advocates of peace on earth are, as a rule, zealous men who mean well, but lack in proper comprehension. They are men of sentiment, unfamiliar with real life, attempting the impossible. They imagine that the great national governments would voluntarily surrender their power—an act which would be neither wise nor right. If the average peace advocates could have their way for a time, they would soon find out that their system would not work." This criticism is about as vague and in the air as can well be imagined. We have a pretty wide acquaintance with "the average peace advocates," and so far as we know they are all men thoroughly familiar with real life. It is because of this familiarity, because they know real life, its struggles, its hardships, and its possible moral and material elevation, that they are such "sentimental" advocates of peace. The "impossible" thing which they are attempting is nothing more than Dr. Carus proceeds to argue for, the substitution of the struggle of truth and justice, by love and moral methods, for the brutal struggle of physical force, proceeding by selfishness and hate. They are engaged themselves in a stupendous struggle of this sort, which has been going on ever since the first peace advocate opened his mouth. These advocates do not imagine that the great powers will surrender their power—he means, of course, the power of their armies and navies—so long as they are ruled by their present ideas. But if we can persuade them, by the "struggle" of argument, that these ideas are wrong and immensely harmful, does Dr. Carus imagine that they will not then voluntarily surrender their present power, for one that is in every way superior? The Doctor does not give any evidence of knowing what the system of the peace advocates is. Does he suppose that "if they could have their way for a time," that is, if they could persuade the great governments, and the masses of the peoples, to sincerely adopt their ideas and their methods, and sincerely entrust to them the formation of the international policies which should govern the world, their system would break down in practice? The "average peace advocate" has "proper comprehension" enough to know that a system which is rooted in the convictions and devotion of peoples and their governments, will work thoroughly well without the sword to make it go. Private individuals, Dr. Carus among the rest, have surrendered something of their power to the community, and more of it still to the higher law of love; and great nations are already beginning to do the same. Some day they will do more of this, until at last they will find armies and navies use-